DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 294 RC 008 962

AUTHOR	Davis, Richard N.; And Others
TITLE	Low-Income Rural People in East Central Arkansas Face Roadblocks to Jobs. Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, Agricultural Economic Report No. 290.
INSTITUTION	Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, Fayetteville.
SPONS AGENCY	Economic Research Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ARK-AER-290
PUB DATE	Jul 73
NOTE	39p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Attitudes; Caucasians; Comparative Analysis; Demography; *Employment Opportunities; Employment Patterns; *Followup Studies; Health; Job Satisfaction; *Job Training; *Low Income; Migration; Negroes; Perception; Racial Differences; *Rural Population; Sex Differences; Transportation
IDENTIFIERS	*Arkansas (East Central); Economic Opportunity Act Title III B

ABSTRACT

From 1967 to 1971, a total of 742 low income, rural people in east central Arkansas were trained with funds provided by the Economic Opportunity Act (Title III-B). A total of 133 of these people were interviewed and divided into the following subgroups for purposes of comparison; (1) 74 respondents (46 blacks and 28 whites) who had been and remained employed following the III-B training; (2) 29 respondents (20 blacks and 9 whites) employed following III-B training but unemployed at the time of the study; and (3) 30 respondents (28 blacks and 2 whites) who had never been employed following the III-B training. The interviews were designed to solicit information relative to: (1) demographic characteristics; (2) employment history; (3) job attitudes; (4) perceptions; (5) transportation; (6) support for employment; (7) internal-external control; (8) health factors; (9) migration; and (10) Herzberg's job satisfier and dissatisfier factors. Among the first two groups, the main roadblocks to jobs during 1971 were "could not find suitable work" and "laid off from work." Reasons cited for leaving their first job after III-B training also centered on being laid off (32 percent) but included transportation problems (15 percent). Among the third group (predominantly black, unmarried, separated, or divorced females with children) major reasons cited for unemployment were inability to find suitable work (70 percent) and ill health (13 percent). (JC)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED1182294

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIC REPORT NO. 290

LOW-INCOME RURAL PEOPLE IN EAST CENTRAL ARKANSAS FACE ROADBLOCKS TO JOBS

RECEIVED
DEC 22 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: RC CE

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

RC008962

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
IN COOPERATION WITH AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

LOW-INCOME RURAL PEOPLE IN EAST CENTRAL ARKANSAS FACE ROADBLOCKS TO JOBS. By Richard N. Davis, Bernal L. Green, and J. Martin Redfern. Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the University of Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology. Agricultural Economic Report No. 290.

ABSTRACT

Records from several souroes revealed that 228 of 742 persons completing a Title III-B Economic Opportunity Act job training program during 1967-71 had obtained employment. Of the 228, a sample of 104 was located and interviewed, with 74 (46 blacks, 28 whites) still employed in 1971, and with 29 (9 whites, 20 blacks) who had previously been employed being unemployed in 1971. The main roadblocks to jobs during the year ending July 1971 were "could not find suitable work," and "laid off from work." Reasons for leaving their first job after III-B training also centered on being laid off from work (32 percent), but included transportation problems (15 percent).

In addition to these 104 respondents, a random sample of 30 persons (2 whites, 28 blacks) was used to represent the remaining 514 trainees who had failed to obtain employment. This last group of 30 tended to be black, unmarried, separated, or divorced females with children. They had experienced unemployment during the year ending July 1971 mainly because of inability to find suitable work (70 percent), and ill health (13 percent).

Key words: Rural labor, Rural labor management, Mississippi Delta, Rural manpower training, Education, Rural labor turnover, and Rural transportation.

PREFACE

This is one of six studies exploring the employability of rural labor, the impact of industry, and social adjustment in two regions--Mississippi Delta and Ozarks. Many people in these regions had requested this kind of research. But primary credit for more careful articulation of the need belongs to Dwayne Couchman and William Starling, Concerted Services Program, Employment Security Division, Arkansas State Department of Labor; and Troy Jennings, W. R. Hart, and Delton Price of the Cooperative Extension Service, University of Arkansas.

Special organizational assistance of Wilson Kimbrough, Department of Psychology, University of Arkansas, is appreciated; along with the on-site help of Juline Norris, Director of III-B Program, Wynne, Ark.; and the programming help of Margaret Banton.

The operation of a continuous training program for low-income people in the study area, 1967-71, represented a relatively unique opportunity to assess such a program's influence on improving the employability of participants. The main findings, based on field work done in mid-1971, are valid at the time of publication, 1975. The delay was due to seminars provided by the authors to cooperating agencies, and to the several reports associated with the studies done in 1971.

A report on one of the above six studies is currently available: Mary Jo Grinstead, Bernal L. Green, and J. Martin Redfern, Social and Labor Adjustment of Rural Black Americans in the Mississippi Delta: A Case Study of Madison, Ark., Econ. Res. Ser., U.S. Dept. of Agri. in cooperation with Ark. Agri. Exp. Sta., Univ. of Ark., AER No. 274, Dec. 1974.

CONTENTS

	Page
HIGHLIGHTS	iii
Unemployment is common for all members of study group. Too few jobs, poor transportation, and ill health are main factors.	
INTRODUCTION	1
Objectives, the Federal training program, the study area and population, sampling procedures, and methods of analysis are explained.	
MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION	6
Study is related to job satisfier and dissatisfier factors conceived by Herzberg in 1957.	
RESULTS	7
Demographic characteristics, employment history, job attitudes, perceptions, transportation, support for employment, internal-external control, health factors, and migration are studied.	
CONCLUSIONS	30
Results of study can aid policymakers in improving management and job training programs in the study area.	

HIGHLIGHTS

Low-income laborers face many roadblocks to jobs. This study, in a predominantly rural five-county part of east central Arkansas, points out the main characteristics of this part of the working force, and their view of management factors and other things in their environment most affecting their employment stability. The study area experienced rapid expansion in industrial employment during the 1960's.

From 1967 to 1971, a total of 742 low-income, rural people were trained with funds provided by the Economic Opportunity Act, Title III-B. Of these, 228 were known to have been employed. Thirty of the remaining 514 who had not been employed were interviewed. In total, 133 were interviewed. They were classified into three groups:

Group I--74 individuals (46 of them blacks) employed at the time of the study.
Group II--29 individuals (20 of them blacks) employed after completing the training program, but unemployed at the time of the study.
Group III--30 individuals (28 of them blacks) who had not been employed after training.

Group III members were mostly black women who had grown up in households headed by women and who themselves had experienced marital instability. Surprisingly, Group III individuals tended to have more years of formal education than did those in the other two groups.

A scale designed to measure the extent that individuals perceive that they can control their own destiny, versus being controlled by outside influences, was applied to all these groups. In general, the groups felt that they were in control of their own destiny, and they had not given up efforts to improve their employment situation.

In spite of the local expansion in industrial job opportunities, the main reasons given by all three groups for being unemployed during the year ending July 1971 were (1) could not find suitable work (34 percent), and (2) laid off from job (27 percent). Considering the groups separately, 10 percent of Group II indicated that they had been fired from a job, and another 10 percent indicated they lacked transportation. Of the Group III members, 13 percent indicated that ill health had resulted in their unemployment. Unemployment during the preceding year was experienced by 69 percent of the entire sample.

Of Groups I and II members who had changed jobs (25 of the 74 in Group I and all 29 in Group II), reasons for leaving their first jobs after training centered on being laid off (32 percent of Group I and 31 percent of Group II). But 8 percent of Group I, and 21 percent of Group II also included transportation problems. Another 11 percent cited their or family members' ill health as the reason for leaving--12 percent of Group I and 10 percent of Group II.

Groups I and II were compared on the basis of how they viewed facets of their work environment subject to management control. Frederick Herzberg's

management theory suggests that there is a basic set of job preconditions which are necessary in the work environment to cause employees to provide ordinary effort. But there is also a set of satisfiers or positive reinforcement items which can cause them to provide their best efforts. Satisfiers include items such as praise, recognition, and opportunity for advancement. Only 49 percent of Group I respondents and 41 percent of those in Group II reported that they were praised often by their supervisors. Three and 14 percent of Groups I and II, respectively, reported that they were bawled out often by supervisors. In general, respondents thought that there were relatively low levels of positive reinforcement in their work environment. A policy implication is that labor instability might be reduced by increasing satisfiers, which are relatively inexpensive. Over half of Group I and II respondents said that the thing they liked best about fringe benefits was health insurance at relatively low premiums. Managers might also want to consider this to promote labor stability.

Perception of the job situation in the area was considered poor by 36 percent of those in Group I, 62 percent of Group II, and 73 percent in Group III. Yet, over half of Group II and III respondents were looking for work. Major reasons given by those not looking for work were no jobs available (42 percent), expecting a child (21 percent), and illness (13 percent). If guaranteed a job "...somewhere else, say in another State," 40 percent of Group I, 52 percent of Group II, and 40 percent of Group III indicated willingness to move (43 percent of all in the sample).

Low-Income Rural People in East Central Arkansas Face ROADBLOCKS TO JOBS

by

Richard N. Davis, Bernal L. Green
and J. Martin Redfern*

INTRODUCTION

Rural development includes creation of industrial parks with associated services, and special training programs to qualify un- or underemployed rural laborers in these new firms. Unless industrial managers in rural areas can assemble and maintain a productive labor force, the potential benefits of such rural development activities cannot be realized. This study focuses on these roadblocks to jobs.

Objectives

Study objectives were: (1) to provide policymakers with information useful in designing programs to improve employability and stability of Delta area laborers, and (2) to provide more information on broad efforts to improve the economic conditions of rural people.

Sample Sub-Groups

For analyses, the sample was divided into three groups:

Group I: Seventy-four respondents (46 of them black) who have been and remained employed following III-B training. 1/

---

* Richard N. Davis, Ph.D. recipient in Dept. of Management, 1973, Univ. of Arkansas, now in Dept. of Management, Chico State Univ., Chico, Calif.; Bernal L. Green, Agricultural Economist, Economic Research Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, stationed at Univ. of Arkansas; J. Martin Redfern, Associate Professor, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Univ. of Arkansas.

1/ A federally sponsored training program authorized by the U.S. Govt., 88th Congress, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as Amended, August 20, 1964, p. 52.

Group II: Twenty-nine respondents (20 of them black) employed following III-B training, but who were unemployed at the time of the study.

Group III: Thirty respondents (28 of them black) never employed (during the study period) III-B training.

Similarities and differences in the characteristics, attitudes, and experiences of the members of each group were studied, then further analyzed to derive implications for improved employability and employee-employer satisfaction.

In addition to comparison of conventional demographic economic and employment data, the groups were analyzed by management facets frequently used by management theorists. These factors included employment preconditions which help to cause employees to exert minimally acceptable efforts, and those which help motivate employees to exert more than barely acceptable efforts.

Study Area

The study was carried out in the east central Arkansas counties of Crittenden, Cross, Lee, St. Francis, and Woodruff, all near the heart of a larger, economically lagging region--the Mississippi Delta (see tables 1, 2, and 3 for population characteristics of these counties). Interviews were made in the summer of 1971.

Study Population

Criterion for inclusion was attendance in a U.S. Government-sponsored III-B training program, during 1967-70. This group was chosen because it was the largest group in the study area trained for employment under a single program.

Title III-B Training Program

The program's goal was to "assist migrant and seasonal farm workers and their families to improve their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a productive and self-sufficient life in an increasingly complex and technological society."

Training activities under the 12-month federally-funded program included basic education, as well as education dealing with social responsibilities, work-related responsibilities, and technical skills.

In the final program year, four major selection criteria were used. Trainees must have earned at least 50 percent of total earned income the previous year as an agricultural employee; been employed only on a seasonal basis and not by one employer for the entire previous calendar year; had income below the poverty level (explained in table 4, footnote 1); and classified as

Table 1--Selected population characteristics of five-county study area, east central Arkansas, 1960 and 1970

County	1970 Population	1970 Percent black	1960 population	Percent rural nonfarm 1970	Percent rural nonfarm 1960	Percent rural farm 1970	Percent rural farm 1960	Percent 65 years and older 1970	Percent 65 years and older 1960
Crittenden	48,106	47	47,564	32	42	8	17	9	7
Cross	19,783	27	19,551	41	42	25	33	11	10
Lee	18,884	58	21,001	35	20	32	56	12	10
St. Francis	30,799	47	33,303	39	34	20	34	10	8
Woodruff	11,655	35	13,954	54	62	22	38	14	11

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census of Population, Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population, Part 5, Arkansas, pp. 133-134; 1970 Census of Population, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Arkansas, p. 171; General Population Characteristics; Arkansas PC(1)-B5 Arkansas, September 1, 1971, p. 171.

Table 2--Percentage of total civilian labor force unemployed, compared with percentage of blacks unemployed, east central Arkansas, 1970

County	All workers	Blacks
Crittenden	7.8	13.6
Cross	8.3	11.9
Lee	11.7	16.2
St. Francis	12.2	18.6
Woodruff	9.6	14.6

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Arkansas, pp. 172, 385-388.

Table 3--Income and poverty status of persons in study area, east central Arkansas, 1970

County	Median income 1/		Mean income 1/		Percent below poverty			
	All	Blacks	All	Blacks	All		Blacks	
					1/	2/	1/	2/
Crittenden	$6,241	$2,658	$7,849	$3,681	33	64	65	79
Cross	6,261	3,404	7,516	4,571	29	66	59	89
Lee	4,043	2,589	5,820	3,980	44	75	62	88
St. Francis	5,532	2,700	6,756	3,902	35	62	62	76
Woodruff	4,488	2,308	5,764	2,805	34	66	68	80

1/ Families and unrelated individuals.
2/ Unrelated individuals.
Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Arkansas, pp. 172, 375-380, 393-396.

either a farmworker or a migrant farmworker. Trainees received a stipend of $30 to $42 per month during the training period.

Sample

A sample of 133 was drawn from the total of 742 trainees in the III-B program from 1967 to 1971. This study sample comprised all 103 former trainees who could be interviewed out of a total 228 who were known to have had jobs, plus a sample of 30 of the remaining 514 trainees--those who still had no job (table 4). 2/

Table 4--Characteristics of trainees in a job training program funded by Economic Opportunity Act, Title III-B, in east central Arkansas, 1967 to 1971

Characteristics	Program year			
	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71
Number of participants	129	147	149	317
Average age, years	32	28	25	26
Average number of children	3.7	2.6	2.0	2.3
Average education, years in school	6.0	5.9	7.7	9.4
Male, number	107	126	109	60
(percent of total participants)	(83%)	(86%)	(73%)	(19%)
Female, number	22	21	40	257
(percent of total participants)	(17%)	(14%)	(27%)	(81%)
Black, number	99	118	130	217
(percent of total participants)	(77%)	(80%)	(87%)	(68%)
White, number	30	29	19	100
(percent of total participants)	(23%)	(20%)	(13%)	(32%)
Average number weeks training	16	11	8	4
Average amount below poverty 1/	$1,871	$1,310	$1,811	$1,534

1/ Based on Office of Economic Opportunity poverty guidelines, 1970. For example, the poverty threshold for a farm family was $1,500 for a single-member family, $2,000 for a two-member family, and $3,000 for a four-member family.

2/ A sample of 30 was drawn systematically by selecting every 17th person from an alphabetical listing of members of Group III. The sample size of only 30 was selected because funds were so limited.

Employment status was checked first with III-B records and staff. These records contained information on (1) direct placements from training, (2) placements following on-the-job training, and (3) responses to an employment status questionnaire sent to former trainees several months prior to this study. Title III-B personnel provided additional information on employment status and location of former trainees.

Identified employers in the study area were given lists of the names of former III-B trainees and asked to identify persons who were currently working with the firm, or who had worked following the dates of their training.

Thirteen firms, ranging in size from about 50 to 2,000 workers and employing a total of about 5,300 workers, participated in the study. No firm refused to participate.

Methods of Data Analysis

The three major statistical tests used were chi-square, "Student's" t-test, and one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). All tests of significant difference were computed on data for the following groups: (1) Group I respondents compared to Group II respondents, and (2) the combined Groups I and II respondents compared to Group III respondents.

MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION

In 1957, Herzberg and others published a comprehensive review and analysis of research on employee motivation. 3/ Conclusions drawn from review of several thousand articles and books showed much disagreement and confusion in the area of job attitudes and the effect of these attitudes on performance.

In a later study, Herzberg established a two-factor theory of motivation which has become popular (and controversial as well). 4/ He defined a number of factors which were "...an objective element of the situation in which the respondent finds a source for his good or bad feelings about the job."

Herzberg concluded that there are two basic groupings of job-related elements--satisfiers, which have a stimulating effect on performance and morale, and dissatisfiers, which can produce negative feelings about the job.

Another important finding was that satisfiers were directly related to the job itself. Dissatisfiers were usually derived from some background factor that caused workers to feel that they were being treated unfairly. Herzberg and his associates further characterized satisfiers as motivators that improved attitudes and performance. They also identified dissatisfiers as hygenic factors that in themselves fail to motivate workers, but that--if adequate and positive--can forestall dissatisfaction and permit motivators to operate.

3/ F. Herzberg, B. Mausner, R. O. Peterson, and Dora F. Capwell, Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinions (Pittsburgh: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh, 1957).

4/ F. Herzberg, B. Mausner, and B. Snyderman, The Motivation to Work (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959).

Following is a more complete listing of satisfiers (S) and dissatisfiers (D): 5/

(S) Achievement: successful completion of a job, and seeing the results of one's work.

(S) Recognition: some act of recognition for achievement by the respondent.

(S) Work itself: actual performance of the job or task.

(S) Responsibility: responsibility for one's own work or the work of others.

(S) Advancement: an actual change in position or status.

(S) Possibility of growth: movement upward in the company or advancing one's skills.

(D) Company policy and administration.

(D) Supervision: technical competence and fairness of the supervisor.

(D) Working conditions: related to physical conditions of work, amount of work, or work facilities.

(D) Salary: wage or salary increases.

(D) Interpersonal relations: interaction between respondent and another person.

(D) Status: some sign of status accorded the respondent.

(D) Job security: factors of tenure, company stability, or instability.

The Herzberg construct was utilized as one of the major theoretical elements in this study.

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics

An analysis of demographic characteristics is one avenue to explore in seeking clues to explain differences in employment stability of groups of people. Thus, this section reflects the opening attempt to formulate and compare demographic profiles of the three study groups.

5/ Frederick Herzberg, "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" Harvard Business Review, Jan.-Feb., 1968, pp. 53-62.

Groups I and II were very similar in demographic features (table 5). Thus they can more safely be compared with Group III. Group III had significantly larger households (5.5 household members compared with 4.9 for the other two groups).

Group III was composed of a significantly greater percentage of females. This may reflect both a lack of sufficient employment opportunities for women, as well as family needs increasing to the extent that women could not maintain steady employment.

Group III had a higher average number of years of schooling than did the combined groups. This was unexpected since it has been usually assumed that there is a positive direct relationship between education and employability.

Marital status differed between the combined groups and Group III. While almost three-fourths of the respondents of Groups I and II were married, only one-third of Group III respondents were married. Of the 20 Group III respondents not currently married, 17 had an average of 3.8 children. Thus, the possibility that unmarried Group III females lack some motivation to work because they do not have families to care for is discounted.

Presence or absence of parents in the household when respondents were growing up differed significantly among the combined groups and Group III. Only 30 percent of Group III respondents experienced both parents present, while about 70 percent of the combined group had both parents present. The fathers of about 25 percent of Group I and Group II respondents had been absent most or all of the time, while the fathers of 43 percent of Group III respondents were absent most or all of the time.

Family support, mainly financial, while growing up also differed significantly between the combined groups and Group III. The father provided over half of the support of the combined group, while the father accounted for the support of only about 17 percent of Group III respondents. The mother supported one-third of Group III respondents.

While 71 percent of all respondents were black, there was a highly significant difference in racial composition of the groups: 64 percent of the combined groups were black; while 93 percent of Group III were black.

The presence or absence of parents and the provision of support while growing up raise some questions about children identifying with their parents. Traditionally, black families are depicted as primarily matriarchal. In the current study, the father was the primary breadwinner in both Groups I and II, while the mother was the most important source of support to Group III. This raises a question: whether the working male image in the black family is more important than a counterpart female image. This is important, since 80 percent of Group III respondents were female.

Differences in housing were significant. A higher percentage of Group III lived with someone else and wasn't directly responsible for housing.

Table 5--Demographic characteristics of respondents, by group, east central Arkansas, 1971

Demographic characteristics	Groups I and II comparisons				Combined Groups I and II, versus III comparisons			
	I		II		I and II		III	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Average number persons in household	4.6	--	1/ 6.3	--	4.9	--	2/ 5.5	--
Average age (years)	30.3	--	27.4	--	29.4	--	29.9	--
Sex:								
Male	33	44.6	10	34.5	43	41.7	6	1/ 20.0
Female	41	55.4	19	65.5	60	58.3	24	80.0
Average years of education	8.7	--	8.8	--	8.7	--	1/ 9.4	--
Marital status:								
Married	54	72.9	21	72.4	75	72.8	10	2/ 33.3
Divorced	6	8.1	0	0.0	6	5.8	5	16.7
Separated	6	8.1	2	6.8	8	7.8	6	20.0
Widowed	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	3.3
Never married	7	9.5	6	20.7	13	12.6	7	23.3
Remarried	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.3
Head of household:								
Yes	37	50.0	15	51.7	52	50.5	17	56.7
No	37	50.0	14	48.3	51	49.5	13	43.3
Location of parents when respondents were growing up								
Both home	52	70.3	20	68.9	72	69.9	9	2/ 30.0
Father gone most of time	11	14.9	4	13.8	15	14.6	8	26.7
Father gone all of time	7	9.4	3	10.3	10	9.7	5	16.7
Mother gone most of time	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	3.3
Mother gone all of time	1	1.3	2	6.9	3	2.9	1	3.3
Both gone all of time	2	2.7	0	0.0	2	1.9	6	20.0
Source of financial support when respondents were growing up:								
Father	38	51.4	16	55.2	54	52.4	5	2/ 16.7
Mother	10	13.5	4	13.8	14	13.6	10	33.3
Father and mother	10	13.5	4	13.8	14	13.6	5	16.7
Mother and sibling	2	2.7	0	0.0	2	1.9	0	0.0
Father, mother, sibling, self	6	8.1	1	3.4	7	6.8	2	6.7
Self	0	0.0	1	3.4	1	0.9	1	3.3
Sibling and self	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0
Mother, sibling, self	2	2.7	3	10.3	5	4.8	1	3.3
Other	5	6.7	0	0.0	5	4.8	6	20.0
Present housing (1971):								
Own	30	40.5	11	37.9	41	39.8	6	2/ 20.0
Rent	33	44.6	14	48.3	47	45.6	15	50.0
Tenant	8	10.8	2	6.9	10	9.7	3	10.0
Lives with parents or friends, owns or rents	3	4.0	2	6.9	5	4.8	6	20.0
Race:								
Black	46	62.2	20	68.9	66	64.1	28	2/ 93.3
White	28	37.8	9	31.0	37	35.9	2	6.7

1/ Significant at the .05 probability level ("t" or chi-square).
2/ Significant at the .01 probability level ("t" or chi-square).

From the demographic characteristics of respondents, then, the major distinctions between persons who worked following III-B training and persons who did not were: number in household, sex, marital status, family background, and race. While housing conditions differed, drawing a direct relationship is more tenuous than in the other demographic characteristics. This is because one cannot say whether unemployment has led to certain restrictions on housing, or--conversely--whether more "flexible" housing arrangements might lessen the need to work. Educational level poses an interesting paradox, since the more highly educated (in terms of formal education) were less successful in attaining employment following training.

Employment History

To reduce labor turnover, personnel departments attempt to secure employment histories on their employees, along with their reasons for quitting previous jobs. Such information can be useful in eliminating objectionable practices and conditions.

Data on current unemployment, summer of 1971, or the consecutive amount of time an individual had been without a job at the time of the study were applicable only to Groups II and III, since Group I respondents were employed at the time of the study. About 69 percent of Group II respondents and all of Group III respondents had been unemployed 7 months or longer, while 20.6 percent and 76.7 percent, respectively, had been unemployed longer than 1 year (table 6). Half of Group III respondents had been without work longer than 2 years.

Table 6--Duration of current unemployment (current being summer of 1971), Groups II and III, east central Arkansas, 1971

Amount of time unemployed	Group II		Group III	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 week	1	3.4	0	0.0
2 weeks	1	3.4	0	0.0
3 weeks - 1 month	1	3.4	0	0.0
2 - 6 months	6	20.7	0	0.0
7 - 12 months	14	48.3	7	23.3
13 - 18 months	2	6.9	5	16.7
19 months - 2 years	1	3.4	3	10.0
More than 2 years	3	10.3	15	50.0
Total	29	1/ 99.8	30	100.0

1/ Does not equal 100 due to slight rounding errors.

Only 17.3 percent of all respondents--31 percent of those in Group I--had not been unemployed at some time during the previous year (table 7). Over one-third of Group I respondents had been unemployed 20 weeks or more during the previous year.

Table 7--Amount of time that respondents were unemployed during year ending July 1971, east central Arkansas, 1971

Amount of time unemployed	Group I		Group II		Group III	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
None	23	31.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
1 week	1	1.3	1	3.4	0	0.0
2 weeks	1	1.3	1	3.4	0	0.0
3 - 5 weeks	6	8.1	2	6.9	0	0.0
6 - 10 weeks	9	12.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
11 - 15 weeks	5	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
16 - 19 weeks	3	4.0	1	3.4	0	0.0
20 - 29 weeks	20	27.0	4	13.8	0	0.0
30 - 39 weeks	5	6.7	5	17.2	6	20.0
40 - 52 weeks	1	1.3	15	51.7	24	80.0
Total	74	1/ 99.7	29	1/ 99.8	30	100.0

1/ Does not equal 100 due to slight rounding errors.

Only 23.6 percent of unemployed respondents were unemployed due to personal reasons--not liking work, participating in a training program, being a housewife, or being pregnant (table 8). Thus, over 75 percent of the unemployed respondents were unemployed for reasons other than choice. Sixty-two percent of the unemployment was attributed to being unable to find work or being laid off. Of those persons in Group III, half had been unable to find work.

Of Group II respondents who left their first job after III-B, 75.8 percent did not stay more than 12 weeks on the job, and 24 percent of this group remained no more than 1 month (table 9).

Of the 103 respondents in Groups I and II, 54 had left their first job after training (table 10). When asked why, nearly half said they had left of their own volition. However, of the 46 percent who reported they quit by choice, most left because of circumstances difficult to control--transportation problem, illness of a family member, or inability to find care for children. The second most frequent reason for leaving was being laid off (31.4 percent of the total terminations).

The entire sample was characterized by high unemployment, frequent job turnover (a high percentage of which was forced), and an apparent ease of shifting among a number of occupations--a fact which may be due to the low skill requirements of most occupations in the study area.

Job turnover in the study group was higher than in the total work force of the 13 firms employing respondents after III-B training. When firms were originally contacted in 1971, and asked to identify former III-B participants among their present or previous employees, they were also asked to indicate whether the individuals were still employed or whether they had quit, been fired, or been laid off. Of the 196 former III-B trainees identified by firms,

Table 8--Main reason respondents gave for being unemployed during year ending July 1971, east central Arkansas, 1971

Reason unemployed	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Could not find suitable work	17	22.9	6	20.7	15	50.0	38	34.5
Laid off	13	17.6	11	37.9	6	1/ 20.0	30	27.3
Ill health	2	2.7	0	0.0	4	13.3	6	5.5
Fired	2	2.7	3	10.3	0	0.0	5	4.5
No transportation	0	0.0	3	10.3	0	0.0	3	2.7
No baby sitter	0	0.0	1	3.4	1	3.3	2	1.8
Total	34	45.9	24	82.6	26	86.6	84	76.3
Housewife	10	13.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	9.1
Dislike work	3	4.0	2	6.9	3	10.0	8	7.3
In training program	4	5.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	3.6
Pregnant	0	0.0	3	10.3	1	3.3	4	3.6
Total	17	22.9	5	17.2	4	13.3	26	23.6
Not unemployed	23	31.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	--
Total	74	2/ 99.9	29	2/ 99.8	30	2/ 99.9	133	--

1/ Had some part-time work and laid off.
2/ Does not equal 100 due to slight rounding errors.

Table 9--Length of time that Groups I and II members had been on first job after III-B training, east central Arkansas, 1971

Time on job	Group I		Group II	
Weeks	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 - 4	7	9.4	7	24.1
5 - 8	4	5.4	8	27.6
9 - 12	9	12.2	7	24.1
13 - 16	7	9.4	2	6.9
17 - 20	7	9.4	0	0.0
21 - 24	9	12.2	1	3.4
25 - 28	5	6.7	1	3.4
More than 28	26	35.1	3	10.3
Total	74	1/ 99.8	29	1/ 99.8

1/ Does not equal 100 due to slight rounding errors.

87 (44.4 percent) had quit, 21 (10.7 percent) had been fired, and 17 (8.7 percent) had been laid off. This amounts to an overall annual job turnover rate of 64 percent, ranging from 0 to 100 percent turnover for different companies. The average annual turnover rate for all employees of the 13 companies in the most recent year, including the former III-B participants, was 47 percent, with a range of from 10 percent to 92 percent.

Perception of Employment Conditions and Job Attitudes

The relationship between employment conditions--especially treatment by managers--and the formation of attitudes about job roles were explored with respondents in Groups I and II. Perception of employment conditions included consideration of possible transportation problems, since the study area is largely rural. It should be noted that Group III members were asked some questions concerning attitudes toward jobs even though they had not been employed since III-B training.

Over three-fourths of Group I and II respondents had little or no problem getting to work (table 11). Eleven percent indicated a substantial transportation problem.

The question on perceptions of actual job conditions on the first job following III-B training were based on Herzberg's construct. Those foundation factors which must be present in a job to prevent dissatisfaction received highly favorable responses (table 12). For example, 90 percent of Group I respondents indicated that they had good working conditions (question 41), and 99 percent said that they liked their boss (question 46). But only 76 percent of Group II respondents said that they liked their boss, a statistically significant difference.

The satisfier-type factors, those which stimulate workers to put forth their best efforts, showed mixed results. Of Group I respondents, only 30 percent said that they had been promoted and 49 percent were praised often by

Table 10--Reason that Groups I and II members gave for leaving first job after III-B training, east central Arkansas, 1971

Reason	Group I		Group II		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Quit of own volition:						
Transportation problem	2	8	6	20.7	8	14.8
Took a different job	5	20	2	6.9	7	12.9
Member of family ill	2	8	0	0.0	2	3.7
Moved	1	4	1	3.4	2	3.7
Did not like job	2	8	0	0.0	2	3.7
Problem with supervisor	0	0	1	3.4	1	1.8
No baby sitter	0	0	1	3.4	1	1.8
Low pay	1	4	0	0.0	1	1.8
Working less than full-time	1	4	0	0.0	1	1.8
Subtotal	14	56	11	37.8	25	46.0
Laid off:						
Work slow-down	5	20	9	31.0	14	25.9
Job completed	3	12	0	0.0	3	5.5
Subtotal	8	32	9	31.0	17	31.4
Fired:						
Problem with supervisor	2	8	1	3.4	3	5.5
Could not learn job	0	0	2	6.9	2	3.7
Absenteeism	0	0	1	3.4	1	1.8
Subtotal	2	8	4	13.7	6	11.0
Health:						
Ill or accident	1	4	1	3.4	2	3.7
Pregnant	0	0	2	6.9	2	3.7
Subtotal	1	4	3	10.3	4	7.4
No response	0	0	2	6.9	2	3.7
Total	25	100	29	1/ 99.7	54	1/ 99.5

1/ Does not equal 100 due to slight rounding error.

Table 11--Method of transportation and related difficulties encountered by Groups I and II members on first job after III-B training, east central Arkansas, 1971

Item	Group I		Group II		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Method of transportation:						
Own vehicle	45	61	12	41	57	55
Rode with friend	21	28	15	52	36	35
Walked	8	11	2	7	10	10
Total	74	100	29	100	103	100
Mechanical trouble: 1/						
Never	41	55	15	51	56	54
Hardly ever (once in awhile)	20	27	6	21	26	25
Often	5	7	6	21	11	11
Didn't use mechanical transportation	8	11	2	7	10	10
Total	74	100	29	100	103	100

1/ Chi-square was not significant.

Table 12--Perception of actual job conditions following III-B training as reported by Groups I and II members, east central Arkansas, 1971

Question	Group I		Group II	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
(S) Promoted (yes)	22	30	4	14
(S) Praised by supervisor (often)	36	49	12	41
(D) Bawled out by supervisor (often)	2	3	4	1/ 14
(D) Like fellow workers	71	96	28	96
(D) Good working conditions	67	90	25	86
(S) Like the work	66	89	25	86
(D) Steady work	61	82	21	72
(S) Organize own job	27	37	7	24
(D) Fair wage	51	69	19	66
(D) Like boss	73	99	22	2/ 76
(D) Boss knows job	64	86	23	79
(D) Boss is fair	63	85	22	76
(S) Opportunity for advancement	42	57	11	38
(D) Job hard or tiring	26	35	12	41
(D) Fringe benefits (good)	52	70	15	52
(D or S) Boss prejudiced	8	11	4	14
(D) High status job	31	42	12	41

1/ Chi-square significant at the 10 percent probability level.
2/ Chi-square significant at the 1 percent probability level.

their supervisor. A high proportion, 89 percent, said that they liked their work. Group II respondents had lower proportions associated with these three factors, especially regarding promotion, where only 14 percent answered in the affirmative.

Only two factors between the groups were found to differ significantly: "reprimanding by a supervisor" (question 39), and a "liking for the boss," both dissatisfiers (question 46). Of Group II respondents, 14 percent reported being bawled out often by their supervisor, while only 3 percent of Group I respondents indicated this problem. Differences were statistically significant at the .05 and .01 probability levels, respectively. While 99 percent of Group I respondents reported liking their boss, only 76 percent of Group II respondents made a similar statement.

Some of the questions contained in table 12 were supplemented by probe questions, such as, "Why is this?" after the response to question 41 concerning whether or not good working conditions were being experienced. Working conditions most often criticized were being hot, or working outside in bad weather. On job security, the most frequent negative answer for both groups was "too many layoffs." Inadequacy of wages was most frequently attributed by both groups to be due to production standards too high for the wages received. The most frequent negative response relating to the fairness of the boss was favoritism toward whites, with favoritism toward other workers in general being mentioned about half as often.

Of all the table 12 open-ended questions, the question on fringe benefits (question 51) received the greatest number of comments. Over half of the respondents of both groups said what they liked best about the benefits was the health insurance which they felt was available at a low premium to them. Vacation with pay was the second most frequent response.

The question on whether the boss was prejudiced resulted in responses consistent with those on the fairness of the boss, i.e., most thought that the boss was fair and not prejudiced. Regarding prejudice, the most frequent response was prejudice against blacks. Prejudice against women, the young, and the elderly were mentioned less often, each with about the same frequency.

Two open-ended questions on job-related factors were asked in an attempt to determine what job-related events had most positively impressed respondents (table 13), and what events had most negatively impressed them (table 14). Of the seven categories of answers to the question of the best thing that happened on any job, five are motivational factors as identified by Herzberg.

When asked about the worst thing that had happened on any job, respondents referred most often to dissatisfiers, the main one being "accident." Nine items classified as dissatisfiers were identified. The negative dimension of two satisfiers (no promotion, made mistake) were mentioned (table 14). As Herzberg had suggested, workers appeared less likely to be concerned with motivating factors--satisfiers--than with base-level maintenance factors--dissatisfiers. Motivating factors become important only after basic job needs are met.

Table 13--Best thing that had happened on any job as reported by Groups I and II members, east central Arkansas, 1971

	Event	Group I		Group II		Total	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
(S)	Promoted	11	38	2	20	13	33
(S)	Pay increase	7	24	4	40	11	28
(D)	Good relations with supervisor	5	17	1	10	6	15
(D)	Getting along with fellow workers	3	10	2	20	5	13
(S)	High production	1	4	1	10	2	5
(S)	Responsibility	1	4	0	0	1	3
(S)	Learning new skills	1	3	0	0	1	3
	Subtotal	29	100	10	100	39	100
	Don't know	45	61	19	66	64	62
	Total	74	--	29	--	103	--

Table 14--Worst thing that had happened on any job as reported by Groups I and II members, east central Arkansas, 1971

	Event	Group I		Group II		Total	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
(D)	Accident	11	37	5	39	16	37.2
(D)	Machine breakdown	3	10	2	15	5	11.6
(D)	Fired	2	7	2	15	4	9.3
(D)	Laid off	2	7	2	15	4	9.3
(D)	Poor relations with supervisor	3	10	1	8	4	9.3
(S)	Made mistake	3	10	1	8	4	9.3
(D)	Hard work	2	7	0	0	2	4.7
(D)	Poor relations with fellow workers	1	3	0	0	1	2.3
(S)	No promotion	1	3	0	0	1	2.3
(D)	Not paid on time	1	3	0	0	1	2.3
(D)	Not paid enough	1	3	0	0	1	2.3
	Subtotal	30	100	13	100	43	100.0
	Don't know	44	59.4	16	55.2	60	58.3
	Total	74	--	29	--	103	--

All three respondent groups were asked questions of what workers liked and disliked most in a job, and what workers most wanted out of life. (Even though it was recognized that some of Group III respondents would never have been employed, it was considered useful to know how this group felt about conditions that would be important to them in a job.) All respondents' rank ordering (in terms of importance) of job factors were treated together (table 15). While no one was significantly dominant over the item immediately following it, the rankings give some indication as to how the respondents perceived the importance of work-related factors.

Table 15--Items which all respondents felt were important to them on a job, east central Arkansas, 1971 1/

Items	Groups I, II, and III			
	Item ranking (1 through 13)			
	1 through 4	5 through 8	9 through 13	Total
	Percent			
(D) Good pay	75	15	10	100
(D) Good working conditions	41	31	28	100
(S) Chance for promotion	34	38	28	100
(D) Having a boss that I like	34	34	32	100
(S) Praise for work well done	31	27	42	100
(D) Having a fair boss	30	38	32	100
(D) Like fellow workers	29	33	38	100
(D) Boss knows work well himself	28	38	34	100
(D) Secure job, steady work	28	34	38	100
(S) Like the work itself	28	32	40	100
(D) Job with high status	17	31	52	100
(D) Good fringe benefits	15	31	54	100
(S) Say in how my job is organized	12	19	69	100

1/ The multivariate analysis of variance test indicated no statistically significant differences among the three groups.

The item ranked first in importance--good pay--was a dissatisfier. Although promotion was listed first among the best events on a job, it ranked third in the list of items important on a job.

Respondents' answers to the question of what workers want most of life (table 16), placed high pay in first position, followed closely by job security. Again, a satisfier (interesting job) was in third position. Differences among groups were not statistically significant in the ranking of items. Neither was the dominance of items significant.

Table 16--Items which all respondents think most workers wanted out of life, east central Arkansas, 1971

Items	Groups I, II, and III			
	Item ranking (1 through 8)			
	1 through 2	3 through 5	6 through 8	Total
	Percent			
(D) High paying job	50	40	10	100
(D) Secure job	46	35	19	100
(S) Interesting job	27	45	28	100
(D) Enough money to get by	27	37	36	100
(S) Job where one can advance	19	38	43	100
(S) Free time to spend with family	14	43	43	100
(S) Plenty of time to do what one wants	10	38	52	100
(D) Easy job	8	24	68	100

When respondents were asked what workers dislike most about work (table 17), answers were consistent with their own most unfavorable single work experience. Differences among Groups I, II, and III in the ranking were not statistically significant. The same applies to dominance of individual items as based on F-test, in rank ordering.

Table 17--Items which all respondents think most workers dislike most about jobs in the study area, east central Arkansas, 1971

Items	Groups I, II, and III			
	Item ranking (1 through 8)			
	1 through 2	3 through 5	6 through 8	Total
	Percent			
(D) Fear of being laid off	52	34	14	100
(D) Fired	44	36	20	100
(D) Not being treated fairly by boss	27	46	27	100
(D) Bawled out by boss	23	46	31	100
(D) Not being liked by fellow workers	18	48	34	100
(D) Injury on job	14	29	57	100
(S) Passed over for promotion	12	26	62	100
(D) Work too tiring	10	35	55	100

There was a statistically significant difference in rank ordering among the three groups based upon their overall responses about the best ways to obtain a job in the study area (table 18). Groups II and III tended to emphasize the same set of ways to obtain jobs (for example, a large proportion

Table 18--Respondent groups' opinions regarding best way for a person in study area to find a job, east central Arkansas, 1971 1/

Ways to find jobs	First and second choices combined, for study group			
	I	II	III	Total
	Percent			
Ranking based on first and second choices combined:				
OEO, Title III-B program	72	52	47	62
Local employment agency	53	48	43	50
Go to companies directly	28	45	43	35
Friends or relatives	26	10	17	20
Newspaper	10	24	23	16
Radio or TV	8	10	20	11
Bulletin boards at grocery stores, etc.	4	10	7	6

1/ In the multivariate analysis of variance test, the tabular value for significance was 0.120; the computed value was 0.166. Thus, there was a statistically significant difference among the groups regarding ways to find employment. In the stepdown procedure to check for dominance of one or more items in ability to discriminate, none was statistically significant. The top item "go to companies directly" was with probability of a larger "F" by chance being 0.19.

indicated, "Go to companies directly"), while Group I emphasized different ways (for example, "Placed by OEO personnel").

Respondents were asked, "Have you ever been refused employment for other than health reasons where you know there was an opening?" Twenty-nine percent answered in the affirmative (table 19). Of the combined Groups I and II, 34 percent answered affirmatively, while only 13 percent of Group III individuals indicated refusal, a statistically significant difference. This suggests that health problems might be associated more with Group III respondents as a reason for job refusals by employers. Overall, perceived reasons for refusal were more often lack of education, lack of training, and racial prejudice (table 20).

Almost 60 percent of all currently unemployed respondents (Groups II and III) were actively looking for work at the time of the study (table 21). The main reason given for not seeking employment was the lack of availability of jobs. Health considerations, either of the respondent or a family member, were also major reasons for not attempting to find jobs.

The job situation in the area was perceived as being poor or only fair by 69 percent of all respondents (table 22). Fifty percent of the study group felt conditions were definitely poor. Only 25 percent of all respondents--most of them currently employed--felt that the situation was good. The major reason for the undesirable situation was simply a lack of job openings (table 23).

Table 19--Response to query concerning refused employment for reasons other than health when they knew that there was an opening, east central Arkansas, 1971

Refused employment	Groups I and II comparisons				Combined Groups I and II, and III comparisons					
	I		II		I and II		III		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	24	33	11	38	35	34	4	1/ 13	39	29
No	49	66	17	58	66	64	25	84	91	69
Don't know	1	1	1	4	2	2	1	3	3	2
Total	74	100	29	100	103	100	30	100	133	100

1/ Chi-square significant at 10 percent probability level.

Table 20--Reasons respondents thought that they had been refused employment for other than health reasons when they knew that there was an opening, by group, east central Arkansas, 1971

Reason employment refused	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Education	9	38	4	37	0	0	13	33
Training	7	29	1	9	1	25	9	23
Prejudice (racial)	4	17	3	27	1	25	8	20
Appearance	2	8	1	9	1	25	4	10
Too heavy	1	4	1	9	0	0	2	5
Too old	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	3
Too young	0	0	1	9	0	0	1	3
Don't know	0	0	0	0	1	25	1	3
Total	24	100	11	100	4	100	39	100

Table 21--Response to query concerning whether or not respondents in Groups II and III were currently looking for work and reasons, east central Arkansas, 1971

Looking for work	Group II		Group III		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	15	52	20	67	35	59
No	14	48	10	33	24	41
Total	29	100	30	100	59	1/ 100
Why not looking for work: 2/						
No jobs available	7	50	3	30	10	42
Pregnant	3	22	2	20	5	21
Must stay home--member of family ill	1	7	2	20	3	13
Will lose other income (welfare)	1	7	1	10	2	8
Not well	0	0	2	20	2	8
Going into military	1	7	0	0	1	4
Waiting to hear of something	1	7	0	0	1	4
Total	14	100	10	100	24	100

1/ Chi-square was not significant.
2/ Percentage based on total not looking for work.

Table 22--Perception of job situation in area, by group, east central Arkansas, 1971

Perception of situation	Group I		Group II		Groups I and II		Group III		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Good	25	34	4	14	29	28	4	13	33	25
Fair	19	26	4	14	23	22	2	7	25	19
Poor	27	36	18	62	45	44	22	73	67	50
Don't know	3	4	3	10	6	6	2	7	8	6
Total	74	100	29	100	103	100	30	100	133	1/ 100

1/ Chi-square was not significant.

Table 23--Reasons respondents thought the job situation in the local area was the way it was, by group, east central Arkansas, 1971

Reason	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All jobs taken (no jobs)	34	74	15	68	21	88	70	1/ 76
Jobs require more skill	6	13	2	9	1	4	9	10
Discrimination (racial)	3	7	4	18	1	4	8	9
Economy down	3	6	0	0	1	4	4	4
Can't tell what jobs available	0	0	1	5	0	0	1	1
Total	46	100	22	100	24	100	92	100

1/ Percentages based on respondents answering "fair" and "poor" in Table 22.

A large majority of all respondents expressed a willingness to take special training to obtain a job or a better job (table 24). Such willingness was indicated by 65 percent, 83 percent, and 87 percent of Group I, II, and III respondents, respectively. The highest percentages of respondents, 17 percent in each case, indicated that their greatest occupational desires were for factory-type work or nursing (table 25).

Internal-External Control

The team of researchers decided to include a set of questions designed to measure, even crudely, the extent respondents felt that they had control over their lives, versus being controlled by others. Thus, 13 questions were included, based on studies by Rotter 6/ and Jessor. 7/ Rotter, citing his own and a number of other studies, suggested that his internal-external scale indicated whether individuals perceive that they can control their own destiny or whether it is controlled for the most part by outside influences, e.g., luck or other people around him. Rotter said that a score indicating internal control suggested that an individual had confidence in his own skills and abilities and that reward was contingent upon his own behavior. However, a score indicating external control suggested that an individual perceived that reward was controlled by forces outside himself.

According to Rotter the importance of attitude toward internal and external control over reward is that,

> The individual who has a strong belief that he can control his own destiny is likely to (a) be more alert to those aspects of the environment which provide useful information for his future behavior; (b) take steps to improve his environmental condition; (c) place greater value on skill or achievement reinforcements and be generally more concerned with his ability, particularly his failures; and (d) be resistive to subtle attempts to influence him.

With thirteen internal-external (I-E) control questions, each having a value of one for the internal answer (zero for external answer), it was possible for each respondent to have a maximum score of thirteen. The average scores for Groups I, II, and III were 8.08, 8.28, and 7.77, respectively. All groups scored slightly higher toward internal control than external control, although none of the groups appeared to be highly internally controlled. Although sample size was too small to apply statistical tests for significant

---

6/ Julian B. Rotter, "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, Vol. 80, No. 1 (1966), pp. 1-28.

7/ Richard Jessor, Theodore Graves, Robert C. Hanson, and Shirley Jessor, Society, Personality, and Deviant Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968).

Table 24--Whether or not respondents would take special training to help them to get a job if one were available, by group, east central Arkansas, 1971

Take special training	Group I		Group II		Groups I and II		Group III		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	48	65	24	83	72	70	26	87	98	74
No	17	23	3	10	20	19	3	10	23	17
Don't know	9	12	2	7	11	11	1	3	12	9
Total	74	100	29	100	103	100	30	100	133	100

Table 25--Response to query concerning the occupation respondents would most like to have, by group, east central Arkansas, 1971

Occupation	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Factory work	13	17	3	10	6	20	22	17
Nurse	11	15	6	21	5	17	22	17
Office work	5	7	2	7	5	17	12	9
Seamstress	2	3	3	10	2	7	7	5
Carpentry	4	5	0	0	1	3	5	4
Electronics	4	5	0	0	1	3	5	4
Mechanics	2	3	1	4	1	3	4	3
Government work	1	1	1	4	0	0	2	2
Welder	1	1	1	3	0	0	2	2
Beautician	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	2
Other	5	7	2	7	2	7	9	7
Don't know	19	26	7	24	6	20	32	21
No response	5	7	3	10	1	3	9	7
Total	74	100	29	100	30	100	133	100

difference between groups on I-E scores by race, a test for all groups combined showed a significant difference (at .01 probability level of chi-square) between blacks and whites, with mean scores of 8.38 and 7.26, respectively. Thus, black respondents perceived a higher degree of internal control over their lives than did the white respondents.

Health Factors

Eighty-eight percent of all respondents indicated that their current health was good (table 26). Group II showed the lowest percentage of persons in good health, 83 percent. Among groups, there was no significant difference on the status of current health.

Respondents' reports of current health problems varied widely. Of the total of 16 persons indicating either fair or poor health, thirteen reasons were given, with only two types of problems being named more than once--high blood pressure (3), and kidney trouble (2).

There was a significant difference between the combined Group I and II versus Group III responses to the question, "Has your health ever been a major problem in preventing you from working?" Thirty percent of Group III respondents indicated that poor health had prevented them from working, compared with 7 percent of Groups I and II combined.

When asked if they had ever been refused employment because of health, 7 percent of Groups I and II combined answered affirmatively, while 13 percent of Group III respondents replied yes.

Information on how often respondents missed work during the previous year's employment because of health problems (table 27) relates mainly to Group III, in which 20 percent were affected. (The employment history of Group III referred to pre-training job status and part-time work, since--by definition--Group III respondents were all unemployed after they completed training.)

Migration

Respondents were asked if they planned to migrate from the area in which they lived (The exact question was, "As you probably know, many people have left Arkansas to find work in Memphis, Chicago, and other cities. Do you have serious plans to move out of this general area during the next 1 to 5 years?"). Only 11 percent of the study group had plans to move, with the reasons for the change associated primarily with work, either actual or potential (table 28). Group III showed the highest percentage of persons planning to migrate, with 17 percent.

A variety of responses were given as to why respondents did not plan to move. A majority of them related to home and friends (table 28). When respondents were asked, "Would you be willing to move from this area if you were guaranteed a job somewhere else, say in another State?" Their responses

Table 26--Health status and related items, by group, east central Arkansas, 1971

Item	Groups I and II comparisons				Groups I and II, versus III comparisons				Total	
	I		II		I and II		III			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Current health:										
Good	68	92	24	83	92	89	25	83	117	88
Fair	5	7	5	17	10	10	3	10	13	10
Poor	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	3	2
Total	74	100	29	100	103	100	30	100	133	100
Health ever prevent you from working:										
Yes	6	8	1	3	7	7	9	1/ 30	16	12
No	68	92	28	97	96	93	21	70	117	88
Total	74	100	29	100	103	100	30	100	133	100
Ever refused employment because of health:										
Yes	6	8	1	4	7	7	4	13	11	8
No	67	91	27	93	94	91	25	84	119	90
Don't know	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	3	3	2
Total	74	100	29	100	103	100	30	100	133	100

1/ Chi-square significant at 10 percent probability level.

Table 27--How often respondents missed work last year (prior to summer of 1972) because of ill health, by group, east central Arkansas, 1971 1/

Missed work	Group I		Group II		Group III 2/		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Unable to begin work because of health	1	1.3	0	0.0	2	6.7	3	2.2
1 - 2 weeks	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	3.3	2	1.5
3 - 5 weeks	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	3.3	2	1.5
6 - 10 weeks	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
11 - 29 weeks	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
40 weeks - 1 year	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	3.3	2	1.5
Forced to quit work	0	0.0	1	3.4	1	3.3	2	1.5
None	68	91.9	28	96.5	24	80.0	120	90.2
Total	74	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	133	100.0

1/ For any job previously held 1 year prior to study.
2/ Data refer to employment held prior to III-B training, and to part-time employment.

Table 28--Plans for migration from area during next 5 years (1971 to 1976) and reasons for such plans, by group, east central Arkansas, 1971

Plan to migrate	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes:								
Job (potential)	3	4	3	10	5	17	11	8
Job (current)	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	2
Friends	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	6	8	3	10	5	17	1/ 14	11
No:								
Home (live here)	15	20	0	0	6	20	21	16
Friends	11	15	0	0	0	0	11	8
Home (own)	10	13	0	0	0	0	10	7
Family	9	12	7	24	7	23	23	17
Current job	5	7	0	0	0	0	5	4
Like area	5	7	7	24	0	0	12	9
Raised here	5	7	0	0	0	0	5	4
Job (potential)	0	0	6	21	4	13	10	7
Don't know	6	8	5	17	6	20	17	13
Don't know if will migrate	2	3	1	4	2	7	5	4
Total	74	100	29	100	30	100	133	100

1/ Two indicated local moves, 5 indicated moves of 50 miles or more, and 7 were not sure about their next location.

indicated a substantially higher proportion of all three groups were willing to move--43.7 percent of Groups I and II combined, and 40 percent of Group III were willing to move (table 29).

CONCLUSIONS

This study examines differences among Groups I, II, and III (see Objectives), which might help explain roadblocks to jobs faced by the groups. Such knowledge, it was reasoned, could help policymakers design improved management and job training programs.

A number of factors were identified which distinguished respondent groups--especially Group III from the combined Groups I and II. Differences found to be statistically significant included:

Number in the household (Group III had more members)
Sex (Group III tended to have more females)
Education (Group III had higher levels of education)
Marital status (more of the Group III members were single, separated, or divorced)
Parents at home (fewer of the Group III members had experienced the presence of both parents in the home during most of their childhood or adolescence)
Parental support (more of the Group III members had depended on their mothers, rather than their fathers, for financial support)
Housing (fewer of the Group III members lived in their own homes)
Race (more of the Group III members were black)
Peer support (more of the Group III members had unemployed friends)

Thus, Group III members, comprised mainly of black females, face severe deterrents to becoming stable members of the labor force. If they are to enjoy much success, job training is likely a necessary but insufficient precondition to steady employment.

The main reasons for unemployment among the entire sample during the year prior to the study were (1) could not find suitable work (34 percent) and (2) laid off work (27 percent). Only 24 percent were unemployed because they didn't like to work, had not been trained, were a housewife, or pregnant.

Knowledge of respondents' attitudes toward their jobs may help management adjust to reduce labor instability. Findings from this study generally support the tenants of Herzberg's two-factor theory. In response to the question, "What do you feel is the best thing that ever happened to you on any job?" the main response was "promoted" (a satisfier). "Fired" (dissatisfier) was the worst thing reported. Of the things respondents felt important in a job, the top three replies included only one satisfier--chance for promotion.

The main fringe benefit mentioned was "health insurance at reduced premiums." Managers might experiment more with the use of health insurance offered at reduced costs to promote labor stability.

Table 29--Willingness of respondents to move if guaranteed a job in new location, by group, east central Arkansas, 1971

Willing to move	Group I		Group II		Groups I and II		Group III		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	30	40	15	52	45	44	12	40	57	43
No	42	57	11	38	53	51	15	50	68	51
Don't know	2	3	3	10	5	5	3	10	8	6
Total	74	100	29	100	103	100	30	100	133	100

In terms of perception of actual job conditions, findings suggest that improved labor productivity could be achieved through adjustments in relatively inexpensive management facets associated with satisfiers. Examples of such facets include designing into the management-labor structure more opportunity for employee recognition, and more frequent promotions rather than one or two large ones spanning several years.

Fifty-nine percent of the currently unemployed respondents (Groups II and III) reported they were actively looking for work, although over 50 percent of the entire sample judged the local job situation to be "poor." Primarily, they felt all available jobs were taken. Thus, 41 percent of Groups II and III respondents had abandoned actively seeking employment at the time of the study. The major reason given was unavailability of jobs in the area.

Given the perceived poor job situation, 43 percent of all respondents said they would move if jobs were guaranteed in another location. Being a household head may deter this decision.

Unemployment among the sample members could be characterized as hard-core rather than short-term. Even among the Group I respondents, nearly 69 percent had been unemployed during the 12-month period preceding the study.

Additional factors affecting employability, notwithstanding availability of jobs, included transportation and health.

Some researchers have maintained that labor instability among the poor results not so much from the external structure of the life situation itself as from internalized fatalistic attitudinal handicaps. These attitudinal handicaps are often termed the "culture of poverty." However, this study's findings refute this concept. Using Julian Rotter's Internal-External Control Scale as an index of morale, respondents reported feeling that they were in control of their own destiny, or internally controlled. They had not given up efforts to improve their employment situation. Blacks expressed a higher level of internal control than whites. Perhaps the greater relative upward mobility that has characterized blacks in the Delta in the past 10 years has led to rising expectations and an increased level of individual self-confidence.